



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,219	12/20/2001	Terry N. Williams	81300520-0008-045	8519
26263 7590 08/07/2008 SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP P.O. BOX 061080 WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080				
EXAMINER KOHUT, DAVID M				
ART UNIT 3626		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 08/07/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/026,219

**Applicant(s)**

WILLIAMS, TERRY N.

**Examiner**

DAVID M. KOHUT

**Art Unit**

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Amendment***

1. In response to the request for continued examination, filed 15 April 2008, the following has occurred: claims 1, 3, 6, 13-15, 19, 21, 24, 30-35, and 40 have been amended; claim 42 has been added.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-10, 13, and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lemble, U.S. Patent No. 5,315,504, reference A on the previously attached PTO-892.

4. As per claim 1, Lemble teaches a method for processing a multi-part form document across a communications network comprising a first access device, a second access device, and a form server, i.e. means are provided to enable user using any terminal connected to the system network to select a form among prestored document forms, fill said form in and then have said form mailed for approval by system users selected based on predefined and stored rules (see abstract of Lemble); the method comprising: receiving at least one request for an operator of the first access device to process the multi-part form document, i.e. a user may initiate a session using any of the terminals attached to the network (see column 4, lines 3-4 of Lemble); determining whether the operator of the first access device is authorized to process the form

document, i.e. a user may initiate a session using any of the terminals attached to the network, and through a log-on procedure reach his/her machine (see column 4, lines 3-5 of Lemble); providing at least one image of the multi-part form document to be viewed by the operator of the first access device, i.e. the layout of the screens which the user is presented with, depends on the original form designer's choices (see column 14, lines 60-61 of Lemble); receiving at least one response from the operator of the first access device including information used to complete a first portion of the multi-part form document, i.e. the user fills-in all the data for a particular item of the Purchase Request (see column 15, lines 57-59 of Lemble); determining whether the operator of the second access device is authorized to process the multi-part form document, i.e. a user may initiate a session using any of the terminals attached to the network, and through a log-on procedure reach his/her machine (see column 4, lines 3-5 of Lemble); providing at least one image of the multi-part form document to be viewed by the operator of the second access device, i.e. if the user is an Authorizer, he will see the screen (see column 19, line 36 of Lemble); receiving at least one response from the operator of the second access device including information used to complete a second portion of the multi-part form document, i.e. the user is shown data modification panels and can add or modify data in the document (see column 19, lines 32-33 of Lemble); wherein the operator of the first access device and the operator of the second access device are in different organizations (this portion of the claim indicates only intended use of the claimed invention and is not given patentable weight, however, Lemble still teaches this

limitation as managers of different department, i.e. organizations, have access to the same document) (see column 20, lines 52-63, and column 21, lines 18-25 of Lemble).

5. As per claim 2, Lemble teaches the method of claim 1 as described above.

Lemble further teaches the method wherein at least part of the information received from the operator of the first access device and at least part of the information received from the operator of the second access device associated are recorded in a database, i.e. a Data Base administrator is provided which contains SQL/DS tools to select; update; insert or delete data from a DATA BASE stored on disks (see column 5, lines 65-68 of Lemble).

6. As per claim 3, Lemble teaches the method of claim 1 as described above.

Lemble further teaches the method wherein determining whether the operator of the first access device is authorized to process the multi-part form document includes receiving information to identify the operator of the first access device, i.e. logging-on means identifying himself (herself) to the system by typing a personal identification code (userid) and in most cases a password (see column 4, lines 5-10 of Lemble).

7. As per claim 4, Lemble teaches the method of claim 3 as described above.

Lemble further teaches the method wherein the information to identify the operator of the first access device includes a password, i.e. logging-on means identifying himself (herself) to the system by typing a personal identification code (userid) and in most cases a password (see column 4, lines 5-10 of Lemble).

8. As per claim 6, Lemble teaches the method of claim 3 as described above.

Lemble further teaches the method wherein determining whether the operator of the

second access device is authorized to process the multi-part form document includes receiving information to identify the operator of the second access device, i.e. logging-on means identifying himself (herself) to the system by typing a personal identification code (userid) and in most cases a password (see column 4, lines 5-10 of Lemble).

9. As per claim 7, Lemble teaches the method of claim 6 as described above. Lemble further teaches the method wherein the information to identify the operator of the second access device includes a password, i.e. logging-on means identifying himself (herself) to the system by typing a personal identification code (userid) and in most cases a password (see column 4, lines 5-10 of Lemble).

10. As per claim 9, Lemble teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Lemble further teaches the method wherein the information received from the operator of the first access device includes a digital signature, i.e. first, the user is recognized for being logged on a virtual machine which the system knows as a "signature" (approval) machine assigned to a registered user (see column 12, lines 61-63 of Lemble).

11. As per claim 10, Lemble teaches the method of claim 9 as described above. Lemble further teaches the method wherein the information received from the operator of the second access device includes a digital signature, i.e. first, the user is recognized for being logged on a virtual machine which the system knows as a "signature" (approval) machine assigned to a registered user (see column 12, lines 61-63 of Lemble).

12. As per claim 13, Lemble teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Lemble further teaches the method further comprising determining whether the

information used to complete the multi-part form document received from the operator of the first access device is valid, i.e. first, it checks all the document data (see column 17, line 39 of Lemble); and whether the information used to complete the multi-part form document received from the operator of the second access device is valid, i.e. the system will display a confirmation panel (see column 19, line 55 of Lemble).

13. As per claim 35, Lemble teaches a system for processing a multi-part form document, i.e. a system for accessing a prestored blank form library, selecting a form, filling-in said form, computing an approval path based on filled-in form data and on specific predefined approval rules referring to user's job or function within the population of system's attached users, and monitoring and controlling the corresponding approval operations (see column 2, lines 21-28 of Lemble) comprising: a first access device, i.e. "Terminal T1" (see Figure 1 of Lemble); a second access device, i.e. "Terminal T2" (see Figure 1 of Lemble); and a form server connected to the first access device and connected to the second access device over a communication network, i.e. unfilled (blank) forms have been designed and stored in the system (SEALSYST) for further use and conversion into documents to be processed (e.g. approved) using the invention (see column 5, lines 12-15 of Lemble); wherein the form server is operative with the first access device and second access device to: determine if an operator of the first access device is authorized to populate at least one section of the multi-part form, i.e. a user may initiate a session using any of the terminals attached to the network, and through a log-on procedure reach his/her machine (see column 4, lines 3-5 of Lemble); receive information used to populate the at least one section of the multi-part form from the first

access device and store at least part of the information received from the first access device in at least one file, i.e. the user fills-in all the data for a particular item and an entry for a document preparation involves read/write operations into the database (see column 6, lines 9-11, and column 15, lines 57-59 of Lemble); determine if an operator of the second access device is authorized to populate at least one additional section of the multi-part form, i.e. a user may initiate a session using any of the terminals attached to the network, and through a log-on procedure reach his/her machine (see column 4, lines 3-5 of Lemble); receive information used to populate the at least one additional section of the multi-part form from the second access device and store at least part of the information received from the second access device in the at least one file, i.e. the user is shown data modification panels and can add or modify data in the document and an entry for a document preparation involves read/write operations into the database (see column 6, lines 9-11, and column 19, lines 32-33 of Lemble); wherein the operator of the first access device and the operator of the second access device are in different organizations (this portion of the claim indicates non-functional descriptive material and is not given patentable weight, however, Lemble still teaches this limitation as managers of different department, i.e. organizations, have access to the same document) (see column 20, lines 52-63, and column 21, lines 18-25 of Lemble).

14. As per claim 36, Lemble teaches the system of claim 35 as described above. Lemble further teaches the system wherein the form server is operative with the first access device to send information included in the multi-part form to the operator of the first access device after receiving a request to process the multi-part form document by



the operator of the first access device, i.e. the user can view all information about the document, i.e. the document itself; the approver list with decisions of approvers who have already acted on the document; the document originator and approvers comments, if any (see column 19, lines 21-25 of Lemble).

15. As per claim 37, Lemble teaches the system of claim 36 as described above. Lemble further teaches the system wherein the form server is operative with the second access device to send information included in the multi-part form to the operator of the second access device after receiving a request to process the multi-part form document by the operator of the second access device, i.e. the user can view all information about the document, i.e. the document itself; the approver list with decisions of approvers who have already acted on the document; the document originator and approvers comments, if any (see column 19, lines 21-25 of Lemble).

16. As per claim 42, Lemble teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Lemble further teaches wherein the operator of the first access device is not authorized to process the second portion of the multi-part form and the operator of the second access device is not authorized to process the first portion of the multi-part form (wherein the operators are the authorizers and the initial user) (see columns 19-20 of Lemble).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claims 5, 8, 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemble, U.S. Patent No. 5,315,504, reference A on the previously attached PTO-892, in view of Bell, U.S. Patent No. 6,272,506, reference B on the previously attached PTO-892.

19. As per claim 5, Lemble teaches the method of claim 3 as described above. However, Lemble does not explicitly teach the method of using a credentialing input device. Bell, however, does teach the method wherein the information to identify the operator of the first access device includes information obtained from a credentialing input device, i.e. authorized users can effect a change by entering new data and then initialing or signing the new entry via a digital biometric signature or initial capture or by electronic signatures that require two separate identifiers (see column 2, lines 30-34 of Bell). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature in order to provide a clear audit trail for evaluation purposes (see column 1, lines 52-53 of Bell).

20. As per claim 8, Lemble teaches the method of claim 6 as described above. However, Lemble does not explicitly teach the method of using a credentialing input device. Bell, however, does teach the method wherein the information to identify the operator of the second access device includes information obtained from a credentialing input device, i.e. authorized users can effect a change by entering new data and then initialing or signing the new entry via a digital biometric signature or initial capture or by

electronic signatures that require two separate identifiers (see column 2, lines 30-34 of Bell). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature in order to provide a clear audit trail for evaluation purposes (see column 1, lines 52-53 of Bell).

21. As per claim 16, Lemble teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. However, Lemble does not explicitly teach the method wherein a date and time of the response is recorded. Bell, however, does explicitly teach the method wherein a data and time that the at least one response from the operator of the first access device including information used to complete the multi-part form document is received are recorded in a database, i.e. a unique routine or set of routines automatically monitor whether a value is changed after it is first entered into the form and, if so, requires the user to authorize the change by sign off before the changed value will be accepted, and which then flags the changed value and stores the previous value, the changed value, the user's initials, and the date and time each value was entered (see column 2, lines 51-57 of Bell). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature in order to provide an audit trail (see column 2, lines 48-49 of Bell).

22. As per claim 17, Lemble and Bell teach the method of claim 16 as described above. Bell further teaches the method wherein a date and time that the at least one response from the operator of the second access device including information used to

complete the multi-part form document is received are recorded in a database, i.e. a unique routine or set of routines automatically monitor whether a value is changed after it is first entered into the form and, if so, requires the user to authorize the change by sign off before the changed value will be accepted, and which then flags the changed value and stores the previous value, the changed value, the user's initials, and the date and time each value was entered (see column 2, lines 51-57 of Bell). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature in order to provide an audit trail (see column 2, lines 48-49 of Bell).

23. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemble, U.S. Patent No. 5,315,504, reference A on the previously attached PTO-892, in view of Ginter et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,892,900, reference C on the previously attached PTO-892.

24. As per claim 11, Lemble teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. However, Lemble does not explicitly teach the method that uses encryption technology. Ginter et al., however, does teach the method wherein the first access device includes at least one encryption application, i.e. normally, most usage, audit, reporting, payment, and distribution control methods are themselves at least in part encrypted (see column 45, lines 30-32 of Ginter et al.). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

incorporate this feature so that the parties can trust that such information cannot be received by anyone other than the intended, authorized party(ies) (see column 14, lines 36-39 of Ginter et al.).

25. As per claim 12, Lemble and Ginter et al. teach the method of claim 11 as described above. Ginter et al. further teaches the method wherein the second access device includes at least one encryption application, i.e. normally, most usage, audit, reporting, payment, and distribution control methods are themselves at least in part encrypted (see column 45, lines 30-32 of Ginter et al.). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature so that the parties can trust that such information cannot be received by anyone other than the intended, authorized party(ies) (see column 14, lines 36-39 of Ginter et al.).

26. Claims 14-15 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemble, U.S. Patent No. 5,315,504, reference A on the previously attached PTO-892, in view of Kyle et al., Publication No. 2001/0032215, reference D on the previously attached PTO-892.

27. As per claim 14, Lemble teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. However, Lemble does not explicitly teach the method wherein the operators can complete only certain sections of the multi-part form. Kyle et al., however, does teach the method wherein the multi-part form document has multiple sections and further comprising determining which sections of the multi-part form document the operator of

the first access device is permitted to populate before receiving the at least one response from the operator of the first access device including information used to complete the multi-part form document, i.e. the information within secure member information repository can be viewed, edited and added to only by the member of form processing system (see page 3, paragraph 0021, lines 6-7 and 9-11 of Kyle et al.); and determining which sections of the multi-part form document the operator of the second access device is permitted to populate before receiving the at least one response from the operator of the second access device including information used to complete the multi-part form document, i.e. only a physician with a physician verified password can authenticate the data entered in any of the medical fields (see page 3, paragraph 0023, lines 6-7 of Kyle et al.). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature so that medical information is appropriately authenticated by the appropriate individuals (see page 1, paragraph 0001, lines 10-13 of Kyle et al.).

28. As per claim 15, Lemble teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. However, Lemble does not explicitly teach the method wherein the operators can complete only certain sections of the multi-part form. Kyle et al., however, does teach the method wherein the multi-part form document has multiple sections and further comprising determining which sections of the multi-part form document the operator of the first access device is permitted to populate after receiving the at least one response from the operator of the first access device including information used to complete the

multi-part form document, i.e. the information within secure member information repository can be viewed, edited and added to only by the member of form processing system (see page 3, paragraph 0021, lines 6-7 and 9-11 of Kyle et al.); and determining which sections of the multi-part form document the operator of the second access device is permitted to populate after receiving the at least one response from the operator of the second access device including information used to complete the multi-part form document, i.e. only a physician with a physician verified password can authenticate the data entered in any of the medical fields (see page 3, paragraph 0023, lines 6-7 of Kyle et al.). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature so medical information is appropriately authenticated by the appropriate individuals (see page 1, paragraph 0001, lines 10-13 of Kyle et al.).

29. As per claim 31, Lemble does not explicitly teach the method wherein the operators can complete only certain sections of the multi-part form. Kyle et al., however, does teach the method further comprising determining which sections of the multi-part form document that the 'operator' is permitted to populate before receiving information from the 'operator' including information used to complete the multi-part form document, i.e. the information within secure member information repository can be viewed, edited and added to only by the member of form processing system (see page 3, paragraph 0021, lines 6-7 and 9-11 of Kyle et al.); and determining which sections of the multi-part form document that the 'second operator' is permitted to populate before

receiving the information from the 'second operator' including information used to complete the multi-part form document, i.e. only a physician with a physician verified password can authenticate the data entered in any of the medical fields (see page 3, paragraph 0023, lines 6-7 of Kyle et al.). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature so medical information is appropriately authenticated by the appropriate individuals (see page 1, paragraph 0001, lines 10-13 of Kyle et al.). The remaining features of claim 31 were discussed in the rejection of claim 20 above and are incorporated herein.

30. As per claim 32, Lemble does not explicitly teach the method wherein the operators can complete only certain sections of the multi-part form. Kyle et al., however, does teach the method further comprising determining which sections of the multi-part form document that the 'operator' is permitted to populate after receiving information from the 'operator' including information used to complete the multi-part form document, i.e. the information within secure member information repository can be viewed, edited and added to only by the member of form processing system (see page 3, paragraph 0021, lines 6-7 and 9-11 of Kyle et al.); and determining which sections of the multi-part form document that the 'second operator' is permitted to populate after receiving the information from the 'second operator' including information used to complete the multi-part form document, i.e. only a physician with a physician verified password can authenticate the data entered in any of the medical fields (see page 3,



paragraph 0023, lines 6-7 of Kyle et al.). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature so medical information is appropriately authenticated by the appropriate individuals (see page 1, paragraph 0001, lines 10-13 of Kyle et al.). The remaining features of claim 32 were discussed in the rejection of claim 20 above and are incorporated herein.

31. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemble, U.S. Patent No. 5,315,504, reference A on the previously attached PTO-892, in view of Ginter et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,892,900, reference C on the previously attached PTO-892, and Wesinger, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,898,830, reference E on the previously attached PTO-892.

32. As per claim 18, Lemble and Ginter et al. teach the method of claim 12 as described above. However, neither Lemble nor Ginter et al. teach the method capable of containing a firewall and encryption and decryption capabilities. However, Wesinger, Jr. et al. does teach a method wherein the form server includes firewall and encryption and decryption capability, i.e. the firewalls may be configured to also transparently perform any of various kinds of channel processing, including various types of encryption and decryption (see column 4, lines 38-41 of Wesinger, Jr. et al.). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble and Ginter et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature in order to

allow two remote machines to communicate securely, regardless of the degree of proximity or separation, in the same manner as if the machines were on the same local area network (see column 4, lines 43-45 of Wesinger, Jr. et al.).

33. Claims 19-22, 24, 26, 28, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemble, U.S. Patent No. 5,315,504, reference A on the previously attached PTO-892.

34. As per claim 19, Lemble teaches a method for processing an electronic multi-part form document across a communications network comprising a first access device, a second access device and a form server, i.e. means are provided to enable user using any terminal connected to the system network to select a form among prestored document forms, fill said form in and then have said form mailed for approval by system users selected based on predefined and stored rules (see abstract of Lemble); the method comprising: receiving at least one request to process the multi-part form document through a first access device including information to uniquely identify the 'operator', i.e. a user may initiate a session using any of the terminals attached to the network, and through a log-on procedure reach his/her machine (see column 4, lines 3-5 of Lemble); providing 'the operator' with at least one image of the multi-part form document, i.e. the layout of the screens which the user is presented with, depends on the original form designer's choices (see column 14, lines 60-61 of Lemble); receiving information from the 'operator' including information used to complete a first portion of the multi-part form document, i.e. the user fills-in all the data for a particular item of the Purchase Request (see column 15, lines 57-59 of Lemble); receiving at least one

request requesting to process the multi-part form document through a second access device operated by 'an operator', the at least one request requesting to process the multi-part form document through a second access device including information to uniquely identify the 'operator', i.e. a user may initiate a session using any of the terminals attached to the network, and through a log-on procedure reach his/her machine (see column 4, lines 3-5 of Lemble); determining whether the 'operator' is authorized to view the multi-part form document and providing the 'operator' with an image of the multi-part form document if the 'operator' is authorized to view the multi-part form document, i.e. a user may initiate a session using any of the terminals attached to the network, and through a log-on procedure reach his/her machine and if the user is an Authorizer, he will see the screen (see column 4, lines 3-5, and see column 19, line 36 of Lemble); receiving information from the 'operator' including information used to complete a second portion of the multi-part form document, i.e. the user is shown data modification panels and can add or modify data in the document (see column 19, lines 32-33 of Lemble).

The reference fails to teach use by a representative of a supplier or medical equipment or supplies and a representative of a physician. However, the difference between Lemble (prior art) and claim 19 relates only to the intended use of the invention (i.e., to the types of people using the claimed invention). A recitation of intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from

Art Unit: 3626

the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

35. As per claim 20, the difference between Lemble (prior art) and claim 20 relates only to the intended use of the invention (i.e., to the types of people using the claimed invention). A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. The remaining features of claim 20 were discussed in the rejection of claim 19 above and are incorporated herein.

36. As per claim 21, Lemble further teaches the method further comprising receiving a digital signature from the physician, i.e. first, the user is recognized for being logged on a virtual machine which the system knows as a "signature" (approval) machine assigned to a registered user (see column 12, lines 61-63 of Lemble). The remaining features of claim 21 were discussed in the rejection of claim 20 above and are incorporated herein.

37. As per claim 22, Lemble further teaches the method wherein at least part of the information received from the 'operator' and at least part of the information received from the 'operator' are recorded in a database after receiving the digital signature from the 'operator', i.e. a Data Base administrator is provided which contains SQL/DS tools to select; update; insert or delete data from a DATA BASE stored on disks (see column 5, lines 65-68 of Lemble).

Again, the reference fails to teach use by a representative of a supplier or medical equipment and a representative of a physician. However, the difference between Lemble (prior art) and claim 19 relates only to the intended use of the invention (i.e., to the types of people using the claimed invention). A recitation of intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. The remaining features of claim 22 were discussed in the rejection of claim 21 above and are incorporated herein.

38. As per claim 24, Claim 21 includes claims 19 and 20 through dependency. Claims 19-21 recite receiving a request to process a multi-part form document, receiving information to complete the multi-part form document, receiving a digital signature, and recording the information received in the database after a signature and claim 24 repeats these steps. The courts have broadly held that the duplication of parts is obvious. *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). As such, these changes do not present a patentable distinction over the applied prior art of record. The remaining features of claim 24 were discussed in the rejection of claim 21 above and are incorporated herein.

39. As per claim 26, Lemble further teaches the method wherein the information uniquely identifying the 'operator' includes a password, i.e. logging-on means identifying himself (herself) to the system by typing a personal identification code (userid) and in most cases a password (see column 4, lines 6-10 of Lemble). The remaining features

of claim 26 were discussed in the rejection of claim 20 above and are incorporated herein.

40. As per claim 28, Lemble further teaches the method wherein the information uniquely identifying the 'operator' includes a password, i.e. logging-on means identifying himself (herself) to the system by typing a personal identification code (userid) and in most cases a password (see column 4, lines 6-10 of Lemble). The remaining features of claim 28 were discussed in the rejection of claim 26 above and are incorporated herein.

41. As per claim 30, the difference between Lemble (prior art) and claim 30 relates only to the intended use of the invention (i.e., to the types of people using the claimed invention). A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

In addition, claim 20 is dependent upon claim 19, which recites access by a representative of a supplier and in claim 30 recites access by a representative of a third party payor, information uniquely identifying the third party payor and its representative, and determining whether access and viewing is authorized. This is a duplication of parts of claim 19. The courts have broadly held that the duplication of parts is obvious. *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). As such, these changes do not present a patentable distinction over the applied prior art of record. The remaining

features of claim 30 were discussed in the rejection of claim 20 above and are incorporated herein.

42. Claims 23, 25, 27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemble, U.S. Patent No. 5,315,504, reference A on the previously attached PTO-892 in view of Bell, U.S. Patent No. 6,272,506, reference B on the previously attached PTO-892.

43. As per claim 23, Lemble does not explicitly teach the method wherein the date and time are recorded. Bell, however, does teach the method wherein the date and time that the digital signature from the physician is received are recorded in the database, i.e. each entry into that field has its own unique data record created and a checksum generated for its value, date, time of entry, and the user specific identifier, such as initials or a signature (see column 5, lines 48-52 of Bell). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature in order to provide an audit trail (see column 2, lines 48-49 of Bell). The remaining features of claim 23 were discussed in the rejection of claim 22 above and are incorporated herein.

44. As per claim 25, Lemble does not explicitly teach the method wherein a second date and time are recorded. Bell, however does teach the method wherein a first date and time that the digital signature from the physician is received are recorded in the database and wherein a second date and time that the additional digital signature from the physician is received are recorded in the database, i.e. each entry into that field has

its own unique data record created and a checksum generated for its value, date, time of entry, and the user specific identifier, such as initials or a signature (see column 5, lines 48-52 of Bell). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature in order to provide an audit trail (see column 2, lines 48-49 of Bell). The remaining features of claim 25 were discussed in the rejection of claim 24 above and are incorporated herein.

45. As per claim 27, Lemble does not explicitly teach the method using credentialing input. Bell, however, does teach the method wherein at least part of the information uniquely identifying the 'operator' is determined from a credentialing input device, i.e. authorized users can effect a change by entering new data and then initialing or signing the new entry via a digital biometric signature or initial capture or by electronic signatures that require two separate identifiers (see column 2, lines 30-34 of Bell). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature in order to provide a clear audit trail for evaluation purposes (see column 1, lines 52-53 of Bell). The remaining features of claim 27 were discussed in the rejection of claim 20 above and are incorporated herein.

46. As per claim 29, Claim 27 recites using a credentialing input device and then repeats this step in claim 29. This is a duplication of parts. The courts have broadly



held that the duplication of parts is obvious. *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). As such, these changes do not present a patentable distinction over the applied prior art of record. The remaining features of claim 29 were discussed in the rejection of claim 27 above and are incorporated herein.

47. Claims 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemble, U.S. Patent No. 5,315,504, reference A on the previously attached PTO-892, in view of Martin et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,862,571, reference F on the previously attached PTO-892.

48. As per claim 33, Lemble teaches the method for processing multi-part form documents across a communications network comprising a first access device, a second access device and a form server, i.e. means are provided to enable user using any terminal connected to the system network to select a form among prestored document forms, fill said form in and then have said form mailed for approval by system users selected based on predefined stored rules (abstract, lines 2-7 of Lemble); comprising: providing a physician with an application to process at least one of the multi-part form documents from the form server, i.e. unfilled (blank) forms have been designed and stored in the system (SEALSYST) for further use and conversion into documents to be processed (e.g. approved) using the invention (see column 5, lines 12-15 of Lemble); determining whether the application should be approved, i.e. the user can Authorize (Approve) the document with PF1 (see column 19, lines 54-55 of Lemble); and providing at least one key to access the at least one of the multi-part form documents from the form server if the application is approved, i.e. a user may initiate a

session using any of the terminals attached to the network, and through a log-on procedure reach his/her machine (see column 4, lines 3-5 of Lemble).

The first part of claim 33 recites the steps as stated above and then the second part repeats these steps with the only difference being that the physician is supplemented with a representative of a supplier. This is a duplication of parts. The courts have broadly held that the duplication of parts is obvious. *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). As such, these changes do not present a patentably distinction over the applied prior art of record.

Lemble fails to teach use by a physician or a representative of a supplier. However, the difference between Lemble (prior art) and claim 33 relates only to the intended use of the invention (i.e., to the types of people using the claimed invention). A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, it meets the claim. The prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use with a physician and a representative of a supplier, and as such the claim is rejected.

In addition, Lemble does not explicitly teach the method wherein the physician's license status is verified. However, Martin et al. does teach the method wherein the physician's license status is verified, i.e. the CVO typically obtains and/or verifies required information about each physician, including, a valid and current license (see column 3, lines 21-25 of Martin et al.). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature to ensure the public that it is receiving adequate care from a qualified medical professional (see column 3, lines 30-31 of Martin et al.).

49. As per claim 34, Lemble further teaches receiving at least one request to process the multi-part form document through a first access device operated by the 'operator', the at least one request requesting to process one of the at least one of the multi-part form documents through the first access device including information to uniquely identify the 'operator', i.e. a user may initiate a session using any of the terminals attached to the network, and through a log-on procedure reach his/her machine (see column 4, lines 3-5 of Lemble); determining whether the 'operator' is authorized to process the multi-part form document and providing the 'operator' with an image of the multi-part form document, i.e. a user may initiate a session using any of the terminals attached to the network, and through a log-on procedure reach his/her machine and if the user is an Authorizer, he will see the screen (see column 4, lines 3-5, and see column 19, line 36 of Lemble); receiving information from the 'operator' including information used to complete the multi-part form document, i.e. the user is shown data modification panels and can add or modify data in the document (see column 19, lines 32-33 of Lemble); receiving at least one request requesting to process one of the at least one of the multi-part form documents through a second access device operated by 'a second operator', the at least one request requesting to process one of the at least one of the multi-part form documents through a second access device including information to uniquely

identify the 'operator', i.e. a user may initiate a session using any of the terminals attached to the network, and through a log-on procedure reach his/her machine (see column 4, lines 3-5 of Lemble); determining whether the 'operator' is authorized to view the multi-part form document and providing the 'operator' with an image of the multi-part form document, i.e. a user may initiate a session using any of the terminals attached to the network, and through a log-on procedure reach his/her machine and if the user is an Authorizer, he will see the screen (see column 4, lines 3-5, and see column 19, line 36 of Lemble); and receiving information from the 'operator' including information used to complete the multi-part form document, i.e. the user fills-in all the data for a particular item of the Purchase Request (see column 15, lines 57-59 of Lemble).

The reference fails to teach use by a supplier and a representative of a supplier or physician and a representative of a physician. However, the difference between Lemble (prior art) and claim 34 relates only to the intended use of the invention (i.e., to the types of people using the claimed invention). A recitation of intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. The prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use with a physician or a representative of a physician and a supplier or representative of a supplier, and as such the claim is rejected. The remaining features of claim 34 were discussed in the rejection of claim 33 above and are incorporated herein.

50. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemble, U.S. Patent No. 5,315,504, reference A on the previously attached PTO-892, in view of *Discount Scooters*, reference U on the previously attached PTO-892.

51. As per claim 38, Lemble does not explicitly teach the method including a Certificate of Medical Necessity. *Discount Scooters*, however, does teach the method wherein the multi-part form is a Certificate of Medical Necessity, i.e. to file a claim with Medicare, a Certificate of Medical Necessity (CMN) is required (see page 2, lines 21-22 of *Discount Scooters*). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature in order to qualify for Medicare reimbursement (see page 2, lines 11-12 of *Discount Scooters*). The remaining features of claim 38 were discussed in the rejection of claim 20 above and are incorporated herein.

52. Claims 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemble, U.S. Patent No. 5,315,504, reference A on the previously attached PTO-892, in view of *Discount Scooters*, reference U on the previously attached PTO-892, and Form HCFA, reference V on the previously attached PTO-892.

53. As per claim 39, neither Lemble nor *Discount Scooters* teach what the Certificate of Medical Necessity looks like. Form HCFA 843, however, teaches a Certificate of Medical Necessity which includes a first section, a second section, a third section and a fourth section, i.e. section A, section B, section C, and section D (see Form HCFA 843, pages 1-2). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature in order to qualify for Medicare reimbursement (see page 2, lines 11-12 of *Discount Scooters*). The remaining features of claim 39 were discussed in the rejection of claim 38 above and are incorporated herein.

54. As per claim 40, Form HCFA 843 further teaches the step of recording the information received from the representative of the supplier and the information received from the representative of the physician is used to create a completed Certificate of Medical Necessity, i.e. section A may be completed by the supplier, section B may not be completed by the supplier, section C is to be completed by the supplier, and section D is to be completed by the physician (see page 2 of Form HCFA 843). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature in order to qualify for Medicare reimbursement (see page 2, lines 11-12 of *Discount Scooters*). The remaining features of claim 40 were discussed in the rejection of claim 39 above and are incorporated herein.

55. As per claim 41, Form HCFA 843 further teaches only the information received from the representative of the physician is used to complete the second section of the Certificate of Medical Necessity, i.e. section B may not be completed by the supplier; while this section may be completed by a non-physician clinician, or a physician employee, it must be reviewed, and the CMN signed (in Section D) by the ordering

physician (see page 2 of Form HCFA 843); and wherein only the information received from the representative of the supplier is used to complete the third section of the Certificate of Medical Necessity, i.e. section C is to be completed by the supplier (see page 2 of Form HCFA 843); and wherein only the information received from the physician is used to complete the fourth section of the Certificate of Medical Necessity, i.e. section D is to be completed by the physician (see page 2 of Form HCFA 843). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the method of Lemble. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate this feature in order to qualify for Medicare reimbursement (see page 2, lines 11-12 of *Discount Scooters*). The remaining features of claim 41 were discussed in the rejection of claim 40 above and are incorporated herein.

### ***Response to Arguments***

56. In the remarks filed 15 April 2008, Applicant argues in substance that (1) Lemble does not teach or suggest a "multi-part" document or where more than one operator in different organizations is required to process the form; (2) claims 5, 8, 11-12, and 14-32 are allowable since claim 1 is allowable; (3) Lemble's reference to a log-on procedure is not the same as Applicant's key; and (4) claims 38-41 are allowable since claim 19 is allowable.

57. In response to Applicant's argument (1), Examiner respectfully contends that Lemble does teach a multi-part document. Throughout the Lemble reference there is an indication that different parts of a form are being filled in with different information.

For example, the "General Expenses Purchase Request (header)" portion of the document and the "General Expenses Purchase Request (Item)" heading each contain different information (see column 15 through column 16 of Lemble). Since there are two portions of the form, this would indicate a multi-part form. In addition, Examiner has discussed the rejection of the newly added claim limitation in the discussion of the rejection of claim 1, indicated above. Therefore, Examiner does not find Applicant's arguments to be persuasive.

58. In response to Applicant's argument (2), since Examiner does not find Applicant's argument (1) to be persuasive, Examiner does not find Applicant's argument (2) to be persuasive since it is founded upon the same reasoning.

59. In response to Applicant's argument (3), Examiner respectfully submits that Lemble in view of Martin does teach supplying a key only when the user's license is verified as shown in the rejection and discussion of claim 33 above. Therefore, Applicant's argument is not found to be persuasive.

60. In response to Applicant's argument (4), since Examiner does not find Applicant's argument (3) to be persuasive, Examiner does not find Applicant's argument (4) to be persuasive since it is founded upon the same reasoning.

### ***Conclusion***

61. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David M. Kohut, Esq. whose telephone number is 571-270-1369. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 730-5 w/1st Fri off. 2nd Fri 730-4.



Art Unit: 3626

62. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Luke Gilligan can be reached on 571-272-6770. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

63. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. M. K./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3626  
8/2/2008

/C Luke Gilligan/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3626